Exhibit 300: Capital Asset Plan and Business Case Summary

Part I: Summary Information And Justification (All Capital Assets)

Section A: Overview (All Capital Assets)

1. Date of Submission: 4/10/2009

2. Agency: Environmental Protection Agency

3. Bureau: Office Of Solid Waste And Emergency Response

4. Name of this Capital Asset: BY2010 eManifest

5. Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: (For IT investment only, see section 53. For all other, use agency ID system.) 020-00-01-13-01-3014-00

6. What kind of investment will this be in FY 2010? (Please NOTE: Investments moving to O&M in FY 2010, with Planning/Acquisition activities prior to FY 2010 should not select O&M. These investments should indicate their current status.) Full Acquisition

7. What was the first budget year this investment was submitted to OMB? FY2008

8. Provide a brief summary and justification for this investment, including a brief description of how this closes in part or in whole an identified agency performance gap:

Under the 1976 Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), firms managing hazardous waste must use a required manifest (EPA Form 8700-22) in order to transport hazardous waste. The current manifest system is a paper-based, business to business process that involves 5.1 million manifest transactions annually. The paper records, which are distributed across 227,000 waste handlers facilities, are then available for inspection by EPA at the waste generators facility for 3 years.

   In 1996, OMB suggested that OSW develop an electronic manifest system to reduce paperwork burden on the RCRA-regulated community. In response to that request, OSW plans for e-Manifest to be a voluntary electronic (internet-based) option that will enable these facilities to initiate, sign, transmit, archive, and retrieve manifests electronically, thereby almost eliminating the paper process. EPA estimates this IT system would provide a significant reduction in the paper work burden labor cost to industry and state governments; comply with the 1995 PRA by acquiring IT to reduce manifest information collection burden on the public, comply with the 1998 GPEA by allowing entities the option to transact and retain manifests electronically, comply with the 2000 ESIGN Act by enabling electronic signatures while continuing to require a paper copy of e-Manifests on trucks for hazmat regulation, comply with the 2002 EGOV Act by promoting the use of the internet to reduce annual manifest paperwork burden on entities; and offer additional unintentional benefits such as supporting Homeland Security initiatives that may benefit from real-time location of hazardous waste shipments.

9. Did the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee approve this request? Yes

    a. If "yes," what was the date of this approval? 8/28/2008

10. Did the Project Manager review this Exhibit? Yes

11. Contact information of Program/Project Manager?

Name

Phone Number

Email

a. What is the current FAC-P/PM (for civilian agencies) or DAWIA (for defense agencies) certification level of the program/project manager?

b. When was the Program/Project Manager Assigned?

c. What date did the Program/Project Manager receive the FAC-P/PM certification? If the certification has not been issued, what is the anticipated date for certification?

12. Has the agency developed and/or promoted cost effective, energy-efficient and environmentally sustainable techniques or practices for this project? Yes

    a. Will this investment include electronic assets (including computers)? Yes

b. Is this investment for new construction or major retrofit of a Federal building or facility? (answer applicable to non-IT assets only)   No

      1. If "yes," is an ESPC or UESC being used to help fund this investment?

      2. If "yes," will this investment meet sustainable design principles?

      3. If "yes," is it designed to be 30% more energy efficient than relevant code?

13. Does this investment directly support one of the PMA initiatives?   Yes

    If "yes," check all that apply: Expanded E-Government

    a. Briefly and specifically describe for each selected how this asset directly supports the identified initiative(s)? (e.g. If E-Gov is selected, is it an approved shared service provider or the managing partner?)   eManifest will provide 227,000 facilities involved in tracking RCRA hazardous wastes with an internet-based option to the EPA form 8700-22. This supports the three eGovernment goals: (1) enhance oversight of waste shipments via internet access to shipment status, and reducing paperwork, (2) meet citizen needs to increase effectiveness & efficiency of the manifest system, (3) collaborate with Federal & state agencies and industry stakeholders for eManifest system design.

14. Does this investment support a program assessed using the Program Assessment Rating Tool (PART)? (For more information about the PART, visit www.whitehouse.gov/omb/part.)   No

    a. If "yes," does this investment address a weakness found during a PART review?

    b. If "yes," what is the name of the PARTed program?

    c. If "yes," what rating did the PART receive?

15. Is this investment for information technology?   Yes

If the answer to Question 15 is "Yes," complete questions 16-23 below. If the answer is "No," do not answer questions 16-23.

For information technology investments only:

16. What is the level of the IT Project? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

17. In addition to the answer in 11(a), what project management qualifications does the Project Manager have? (per CIO Council PM Guidance)

18. Is this investment or any project(s) within this investment identified as "high risk" on the Q4 - FY 2008 agency high risk report (per OMB Memorandum M-05-23)   No

19. Is this a financial management system?   No

    a. If "yes," does this investment address a FFMIA compliance area?   No

      1. If "yes," which compliance area:

      2. If "no," what does it address?

    b. If "yes," please identify the system name(s) and system acronym(s) as reported in the most recent financial systems inventory update required by Circular A-11 section 52

20. What is the percentage breakout for the total FY2010 funding request for the following? (This should total 100%)

Hardware	5
Software	78
Services	17
Other	0

21. If this project produces information dissemination products for the public, are these products published to the Internet in conformance with OMB Memorandum 05-04 and included in your agency inventory, schedules and priorities?   N/A

22. Contact information of individual responsible for privacy related questions:

Name

Phone Number

Title

E-mail

23. Are the records produced by this investment appropriately scheduled with the National Archives and Records Administration's approval?	Yes

Question 24 must be answered by all Investments:

24. Does this investment directly support one of the GAO High Risk Areas?	No

Section B: Summary of Spending (All Capital Assets)

1. Provide the total estimated life-cycle cost for this investment by completing the following table. All amounts represent budget authority in millions, and are rounded to three decimal places. Federal personnel costs should be included only in the row designated "Government FTE Cost," and should be excluded from the amounts shown for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." The "TOTAL" estimated annual cost of the investment is the sum of costs for "Planning," "Full Acquisition," and "Operation/Maintenance." For Federal buildings and facilities, life-cycle costs should include long term energy, environmental, decommissioning, and/or restoration costs. The costs associated with the entire life-cycle of the investment should be included in this report.

Table 1: SUMMARY OF SPENDING FOR PROJECT PHASES (REPORTED IN MILLIONS) (Estimates for BY+1 and beyond are for planning purposes only and do not represent budget decisions)									
	PY-1 and earlier	PY 2008	CY 2009	BY 2010	BY+1 2011	BY+2 2012	BY+3 2013	BY+4 and beyond	Total
Planning:	0	0	0	0					
Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Subtotal Planning & Acquisition:	0	0	0	0					
Operations & Maintenance:	0	0	0	0					
TOTAL:	0	0	0	0					
Government FTE Costs should not be included in the amounts provided above.									
Government FTE Costs	0	0	0	0					
Number of FTE represented by Costs:	0	0	0	0					

Note: For the multi-agency investments, this table should include all funding (both managing partner and partner agencies). Government FTE Costs should not be included as part of the TOTAL represented.

2. Will this project require the agency to hire additional FTE's?

  a. If "yes," How many and in what year?

3. If the summary of spending has changed from the FY2009 President's budget request, briefly explain those changes:

Section C: Acquisition/Contract Strategy (All Capital Assets)

1. Complete the table for all (including all non-Federal) contracts and/or task orders currently in place or planned for this investment. Total Value should include all option years for each contract. Contracts and/or task orders completed do not need to be included.

Contracts/Task Orders Table:																* Costs in millions
Contract or Task Order Number	Type of Contract/ Task Order (In accordance with FAR Part 16)	Has the contract been awarded (Y/N)	If so what is the date of the award? If not, what is the planned award date?	Start date of Contract/ Task Order	End date of Contract/ Task Order	Total Value of Contract/ Task Order ($M)	Is this an Interagency Acquisition ? (Y/N)	Is it performance based? (Y/N)	Competitively awarded? (Y/N)	What, if any, alternative financing option is being used? (ESPC, UESC, EUL, N/A)	Is EVM in the contract? (Y/N)	Does the contract include the required security & privacy clauses? (Y/N)	Name of CO	CO Contact information (phone/email)	Contracting Officer FAC-C or DAWIA Certification Level (Level 1, 2, 3, N/A)	If N/A, has the agency determined the CO assigned has the competencies and skills necessary to support this acquisition ? (Y/N)

2. If earned value is not required or will not be a contract requirement for any of the contracts or task orders above, explain why:

3. Do the contracts ensure Section 508 compliance?   Yes

a. Explain why not or how this is being done?   All contracts, when awarded will use EPAAR clause 1552.211-79 "COMPLIANCE WITH EPA POLICIES FOR INFORMATION RESOURCES MANAGEMENT" to ensure 508 compliance. E-manifest will comply with paragraph n of Subpart B Section 1194.22 "When electronic forms are designed to be completed online, the form shall allow people using assistive technology to access the information, field elements, and functionality required for completion and submission of the form, including all directions and cues."

4. Is there an acquisition plan which reflects the requirements of FAR Subpart 7.1 and has been approved in accordance with agency requirements?   No

　　　a. If "yes," what is the date?

　　　　　1. Is it Current?

　　　b. If "no," will an acquisition plan be developed?   Yes

　　　　1. If "no," briefly explain why:

Section D: Performance Information (All Capital Assets)

In order to successfully address this area of the exhibit 300, performance goals must be provided for the agency and be linked to the annual performance plan. The investment must discuss the agency's mission and strategic goals, and performance measures (indicators) must be provided. These goals need to map to the gap in the agency's strategic goals and objectives this investment is designed to fill. They are the internal and external performance benefits this investment is expected to deliver to the agency (e.g., improve efficiency by 60 percent, increase citizen participation by 300 percent a year to achieve an overall citizen participation rate of 75 percent by FY 2xxx, etc.). The goals must be clearly measurable investment outcomes, and if applicable, investment outputs. They do not include the completion date of the module, milestones, or investment, or general goals, such as, significant, better, improved that do not have a quantitative or qualitative measure.

Agencies must use the following table to report performance goals and measures for the major investment and use the Federal Enterprise Architecture (FEA) Performance Reference Model (PRM). Map all Measurement Indicators to the corresponding "Measurement Area" and "Measurement Grouping" identified in the PRM. There should be at least one Measurement Indicator for each of the four different Measurement Areas (for each fiscal year). The PRM is available at www.egov.gov. The table can be extended to include performance measures for years beyond the next President's Budget.

Performance Information Table								
Fiscal Year	Strategic Goal(s) Supported	Measurement Area	Measurement Category	Measurement Grouping	Measurement Indicator	Baseline	Target	Actual Results
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2008	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Quality	Complaints				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2009	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing				Emanifest is awaiting legislation.
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Customer Results	Customer Benefit	Customer Impact or Burden				
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Mission and Business Results	Environmental Management	Pollution Prevention and Control				

Performance Information Table							
Fiscal Year	**Strategic Goal(s) Supported**	**Measurement Area**	**Measurement Category**	**Measurement Grouping**	**Measurement Indicator**	**Baseline**	**Target**	**Actual Results**
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Processes and Activities	Cycle Time and Timeliness	Cycle Time				
2010	Goal 3: Land Preservation and Restoration	Technology	Information and Data	External Data Sharing				

Section E: Security and Privacy (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the business case, each question below must be answered at the system/application level, not at a program or agency level. Systems supporting this investment on the planning and operational systems security tables should match the systems on the privacy table below. Systems on the Operational Security Table must be included on your agency FISMA system inventory and should be easily referenced in the inventory (i.e., should use the same name or identifier).

For existing Mixed-Life Cycle investments where enhancement, development, and/or modernization is planned, include the investment in both the "Systems in Planning" table (Table 3) and the "Operational Systems" table (Table 4). Systems which are already operational, but have enhancement, development, and/or modernization activity, should be included in both Table 3 and Table 4. Table 3 should reflect the planned date for the system changes to be complete and operational, and the planned date for the associated C&A update. Table 4 should reflect the current status of the requirements listed. In this context, information contained within Table 3 should characterize what updates to testing and documentation will occur before implementing the enhancements; and Table 4 should characterize the current state of the materials associated with the existing system.

All systems listed in the two security tables should be identified in the privacy table. The list of systems in the "Name of System" column of the privacy table (Table 8) should match the systems listed in columns titled "Name of System" in the security tables (Tables 3 and 4). For the Privacy table, it is possible that there may not be a one-to-one ratio between the list of systems and the related privacy documents. For example, one PIA could cover multiple systems. If this is the case, a working link to the PIA may be listed in column (d) of the privacy table more than once (for each system covered by the PIA).

The questions asking whether there is a PIA which covers the system and whether a SORN is required for the system are discrete from the narrative fields. The narrative column provides an opportunity for free text explanation why a working link is not provided. For example, a SORN may be required for the system, but the system is not yet operational. In this circumstance, answer "yes" for column (e) and in the narrative in column (f), explain that because the system is not operational the SORN is not yet required to be published.

Please respond to the questions below and verify the system owner took the following actions:

1. Have the IT security costs for the system(s) been identified   Yes
and integrated into the overall costs of the investment?:

    a. If "yes," provide the "Percentage IT Security" for the   10
budget year:

2. Is identifying and assessing security and privacy risks a part   Yes
of the overall risk management effort for each system
supporting or part of this investment?

3. Systems in Planning and Undergoing Enhancement(s), Development, and/or Modernization - Security Table(s):			
Name of System	**Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?**	**Planned Operational Date**	**Date of Planned C&A update (for existing mixed life cycle systems) or Planned Completion Date (for new systems)**
eManifest			

4. Operational Systems - Security Table:

Name of System	Agency/ or Contractor Operated System?	NIST FIPS 199 Risk Impact level (High, Moderate, Low)	Has C&A been Completed, using NIST 800-37? (Y/N)	Date Completed: C&A	What standards were used for the Security Controls tests? (FIPS 200/NIST 800-53, Other, N/A)	Date Completed: Security Control Testing	Date the contingency plan tested

5. Have any weaknesses, not yet remediated, related to any of the systems part of or supporting this investment been identified by the agency or IG?   No

    a. If "yes," have those weaknesses been incorporated into the agency's plan of action and milestone process?

6. Indicate whether an increase in IT security funding is requested to remediate IT security weaknesses?   No

    a. If "yes," specify the amount, provide a general description of the weakness, and explain how the funding request will remediate the weakness.

7. How are contractor security procedures monitored, verified, and validated by the agency for the contractor systems above?

8. Planning & Operational Systems - Privacy Table:

(a) Name of System	(b) Is this a new system? (Y/N)	(c) Is there at least one Privacy Impact Assessment (PIA) which covers this system? (Y/N)	(d) Internet Link or Explanation	(e) Is a System of Records Notice (SORN) required for this system? (Y/N)	(f) Internet Link or Explanation
eManifest	Yes	Yes	This system does not collect PII on members of the public. Therefore, no PIA is required to be posted.	No	No, because the system is not a Privacy Act system of records.

Details for Text Options:
Column (d): If yes to (c), provide the link(s) to the publicly posted PIA(s) with which this system is associated. If no to (c), provide an explanation why the PIA has not been publicly posted or why the PIA has not been conducted.

Column (f): If yes to (e), provide the link(s) to where the current and up to date SORN(s) is published in the federal register. If no to (e), provide an explanation why the SORN has not been published or why there isn't a current and up to date SORN.

Note: Working links must be provided to specific documents not general privacy websites. Non-working links will be considered as a blank field.

Section F: Enterprise Architecture (EA) (IT Capital Assets only)

In order to successfully address this area of the capital asset plan and business case, the investment must be included in the agency's EA and Capital Planning and Investment Control (CPIC) process and mapped to and supporting the FEA. The business case must demonstrate the relationship between the investment and the business, performance, data, services, application, and technology layers of the agency's EA.

1. Is this investment included in your agency's target enterprise architecture?   Yes

    a. If "no," please explain why?

2. Is this investment included in the agency's EA Transition Strategy?   Yes

    a. If "yes," provide the investment name as identified in the Transition Strategy provided in the agency's most recent annual EA Assessment.   eManifest

    b. If "no," please explain why?

3. Is this investment identified in a completed and approved segment architecture?   Yes

    a. If "yes," provide the six digit code corresponding to the agency segment architecture. The segment architecture codes are maintained by the agency Chief Architect. For detailed guidance regarding segment architecture codes, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.   325-000

4. Service Component Reference Model (SRM) Table:								
Identify the service components funded by this major IT investment (e.g., knowledge management, content management, customer relationship management, etc.). Provide this information in the format of the following table. For detailed guidance regarding components, please refer to http://www.egov.gov.								
Agency Component Name	**Agency Component Description**	**FEA SRM Service Domain**	**FEA SRM Service Type**	**FEA SRM Component (a)**	**Service Component Reused Name (b)**	**Service Component Reused UPI (b)**	**Internal or External Reuse? (c)**	**BY Funding Percentage (d)**
eManifest	It is expected that eManifest will provide an on line tutorial to assist users in the proper use of eManifest.	Customer Services	Customer Initiated Assistance	Online Tutorials			No Reuse	1
eManifest	A planned new internet web-based IT application to become operational in FY2009, to be hosted on EPA&amp;amp;apos;s Central Data Exchange (CDX) computer hub, to provide 140,000 industrial and Federal facilities and state governments involved with RCRA hazardous waste transport, with a voluntary electronic option for processing EPA&amp;amp;apos;s RCRA manifest (EPA Form 8700-22) which is required to accompany hazardous waste shipments and be archived for three years.	Customer Services	Customer Preferences	Alerts and Notifications	Data Exchange	020-00-01-16-02-6029-00	Internal	95
eManifest	It is expected that eManifests will support computer, telephone, software, and server intergration as a single logical entity.	Support Services	Communication	Computer / Telephony Integration			No Reuse	2
eManifest	It is expected that eManifest will need to provide for issue tracking within the eManifest application.	Support Services	Systems Management	Issue Tracking			No Reuse	2

a. Use existing SRM Components or identify as "NEW". A "NEW" component is one not already identified as a service component in the FEA SRM.

b. A reused component is one being funded by another investment, but being used by this investment. Rather than answer yes or no, identify the reused service component funded by the other investment and identify the other investment using the Unique Project Identifier (UPI) code from the OMB Ex 300 or Ex 53 submission.

c. 'Internal' reuse is within an agency. For example, one agency within a department is reusing a service component provided by another agency within the same department. 'External' reuse is one agency within a department reusing a service component provided by another agency in another department. A good example of this is an E-Gov initiative service being reused by multiple organizations across the federal government.

d. Please provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount used for each service component listed in the table. If external, provide the percentage of the BY requested funding amount transferred to another agency to pay for the service. The percentages in the column can, but are not required to, add up to 100%.

5. Technical Reference Model (TRM) Table:
To demonstrate how this major IT investment aligns with the FEA Technical Reference Model (TRM), please list the Service Areas, Categories, Standards, and Service Specifications supporting this IT investment.

FEA SRM Component (a)	FEA TRM Service Area	FEA TRM Service Category	FEA TRM Service Standard	Service Specification (b) (i.e., vendor and product name)
Online Tutorials	Service Access and Delivery	Access Channels	Web Browser	
Computer / Telephony Integration	Service Access and Delivery	Delivery Channels	Internet	
Alerts and Notifications	Service Access and Delivery	Service Requirements	Legislative / Compliance	
Issue Tracking	Service Interface and Integration	Interoperability	Data Format / Classification	

    a. Service Components identified in the previous question should be entered in this column. Please enter multiple rows for FEA SRM Components supported by multiple TRM Service Specifications

    b. In the Service Specification field, agencies should provide information on the specified technical standard or vendor product mapped to the FEA TRM Service Standard, including model or version numbers, as appropriate.

6. Will the application leverage existing components and/or applications across the Government (i.e., USA.gov, Pay.Gov, etc)?   Yes

    a. If "yes," please describe.

Exhibit 300: Part II: Planning, Acquisition and Performance Information

Section A: Alternatives Analysis (All Capital Assets)

Part II should be completed only for investments identified as "Planning" or "Full Acquisition," or "Mixed Life-Cycle" investments in response to Question 6 in Part I, Section A above.

In selecting the best capital asset, you should identify and consider at least three viable alternatives, in addition to the current baseline, i.e., the status quo. Use OMB Circular A-94 for all investments and the Clinger Cohen Act of 1996 for IT investments to determine the criteria you should use in your Benefit/Cost Analysis.

1. Did you conduct an alternatives analysis for this project?   Yes

    a. If "yes," provide the date the analysis was completed?   6/17/2008

    b. If "no," what is the anticipated date this analysis will be completed?

    c. If no analysis is planned, please briefly explain why:

2. Alternative Analysis Results:
Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table: * Costs in millions

Alternative Analyzed	Description of Alternative	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Costs estimate	Risk Adjusted Lifecycle Benefits estimate
Baseline	Status quo - no EPA manifest system. Baseline cost represents paper manifest burden to 227,000 industrial facilities &amp; 23 state goverments.		
Decentralized COTS Vendor Software eManifest IT Products	Decentralized (ad hoc) state-by-state eManifest approach consisting of non-interoperable and company-by-company customized or COTS software IT solutions to eManifest. EPA would provide the regulatory authority and set parameters for this decentralized eManifest approach. This was the main IT option for eManifest described in OSW's 22 May 2001 eManifest proposed rule (http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/gener/manifest/mods.htm#proposed).		
EPA-hosted centralized eManifest IT system	OSW develops an eManifest system to be hosted on EPA's existing Central Data Exchange (CDX) IT hub and National Environmental Information Exchange Network. eManifest becomes a part of EPA's CDX infrastructure which is designed specifically to host multiple systems involving environmental data reporting to EPA and to state governments. This is the stakeholder preferred approach from OSW's 19-20 May 2004 eManifest stakeholder meeting (http://www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/gener/manif		
NGO-sponsored centralized eManifest IT System	A centralized eManifest system privately-funded, developed, and hosted by a waste handler industry association non-governmental organization (NGO). OSW provides the RCRA regulatory authority and sets parameters for the NGO to fund and implement this eManifest approach. An example of a possible NGO would be the Environmental Technology Council (http://www.etc.org) which represents 10 to 15 of the largest hazardous waste transport companies, accounting for 45% of annual manifest activity.		

3. Which alternative was selected by the Agency's Executive/Investment Committee and why was it chosen?

OSW selected Alternative 2 (the EPA hosted centralized IT design approach) for eManifest as it was the preferred option by OSW's eManifest stakeholders (i.e., hazardous waste management industry associations, hazardous waste generators, Federal facilities which generate hazardous wastes, state government waste regulators), as determined in OSW's May 2004 stakeholder meeting, and reaffirmed in subsequent meetings.

a. What year will the investment breakeven? (Specifically, when the budgeted costs savings exceed the cumulative costs.)

4. What specific qualitative benefits will be realized?

5. Federal Quantitative Benefits
What specific quantitative benefits will be realized (using current dollars) Use the results of your alternatives analysis to complete the following table:

	Budgeted Cost Savings	Cost Avoidance	Justification for Budgeted Cost Savings	Justification for Budgeted Cost Avoidance
PY - 1 2007 & Prior	0	0	IT System not operational	
PY 2008	0	0	IT System not operational	
CY 2009	0	0	IT System not operational	
BY 2010	0	0	IT System not operational	
BY + 1 2011				
BY + 2 2012				
BY + 3 2013				
BY + 4 2014 & Beyond				
Total LCC Benefit			LCC = Life-cycle Cost	

6. Will the selected alternative replace a legacy system in-part or in-whole?   No

   a. If "yes," are the migration costs associated with the migration to the selected alternative included in this investment, the legacy investment, or in a separate migration investment?

   b. If "yes," please provide the following information:

5b. List of Legacy Investment or Systems

Name of the Legacy Investment of Systems	UPI if available	Date of the System Retirement

Section B: Risk Management (All Capital Assets)

You should have performed a risk assessment during the early planning and initial concept phase of this investment's life-cycle, developed a risk-adjusted life-cycle cost estimate and a plan to eliminate, mitigate or manage risk, and be actively managing risk throughout the investment's life-cycle.

1. Does the investment have a Risk Management Plan?   Yes

   a. If "yes," what is the date of the plan?   7/13/2007

   b. Has the Risk Management Plan been significantly changed since last year's submission to OMB?   No

c. If "yes," describe any significant changes:

2. If there currently is no plan, will a plan be developed?

   a. If "yes," what is the planned completion date?

   b. If "no," what is the strategy for managing the risks?

3. Briefly describe how investment risks are reflected in the life cycle cost estimate and investment schedule:

Section C: Cost and Schedule Performance (All Capital Assets)

EVM is required only on DME portions of investments. For mixed lifecycle investments, O&M milestones should still be included in the table (Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline). This table should accurately reflect the milestones in the initial baseline, as well as milestones in the current baseline.

1. Does the earned value management system meet the criteria in ANSI/EIA Standard-748?   Yes

2. Is the CV% or SV% greater than +/- 10%? (CV%= CV/EV x 100; SV%= SV/PV x 100)   No

   a. If "yes," was it the CV or SV or both?

b. If "yes," explain the causes of the variance:

c. If "yes," describe the corrective actions:

3. Has the investment re-baselined during the past fiscal year?   No

a. If "yes," when was it approved by the agency head?

4. Comparison of Initial Baseline and Current Approved Baseline

Complete the following table to compare actual performance against the current performance baseline and to the initial performance baseline. In the Current Baseline section, for all milestones listed, you should provide both the baseline and actual completion dates (e.g., "03/23/2003"/ "04/28/2004") and the baseline and actual total costs (in $ Millions). In the event that a milestone is not found in both the initial and current baseline, leave the associated cells blank. Note that the 'Description of Milestone' and 'Percent Complete' fields are required. Indicate '0' for any milestone no longer active.

Milestone Number	Description of Milestone	Initial Baseline		Current Baseline				Current Baseline Variance		Percent Complete
		Planned Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)	Total Cost ($M) Estimated	Completion Date (mm/dd/yyyy)		Total Cost ($M)		Schedule (# days)	Cost ($M)	
				Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual			
0	Milestones are to be determined. (The investment will use performance-based management once the legislative authority is received and the share-in-revenue concept is implemented.)								0	0%
Project Totals										